

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jerry King,	)	Case No.: 4:22-cv-01720-JD-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
	)	
Honda Trading, People Ready Temp Agency,	)	
Jessica Roark, Maureen in H.R.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

This matter is before the Court with the Report and Recommendation (“Report and Recommendation” or “Report”) of United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(g) of the District of South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> (DE 19.) Plaintiff Jerry King (“Plaintiff” or “King”), proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging employment discrimination against Defendants Honda Trading, People Ready Temp Agency, Jessica Roark, Maureen in H.R., because “[a] white female was allowed to discriminate against [him] and [was] never reprimanded.” (DE 1, p. 5.) Plaintiff alleges Defendants “refused to hear [his] complaint[,]” and he was subsequently terminated. (Id.)

The Report was issued on August 4, 2022, recommending dismissal of the individual defendants Jessica Roark and Maureen in H.R. with prejudice. Although Plaintiff purportedly filed an Objection, Plaintiff’s objection states, “Pro se Plaintiff is in agreement with the Court that this

---


<sup>1</sup> The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

case is against the two employers, Honda Trading and People Ready Temp Agency.” (DE 24, p. 2.) In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

Accordingly, after a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the Court adopts the Report (DE 19) and incorporates it herein.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that Defendants Jessica Roark and Maureen in H.R. are dismissed with prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
Joseph Dawson, III  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
February 22, 2023

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.